

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 07 2006

PATENT

Docket No.: ST00015USU1 (108-US-U1)  
09/938,459REMARKSSTATUS SUMMARY

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has objected to claims 7-11, 13, 14, and 16-20 for certain formalities. The Examiner has rejected claims 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-8 and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,241,561 to *Barnard* ("*Barnard*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,517,529 to *Stehlik* ("*Stehlik*") and claims 9-11, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barnard* in view of *Stehlik*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,041 to *Krasner* ("*Krasner*").

These formal matters identified in the Office Action are addressed herein below.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS

Claims 7, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are objected for certain formalities. Applicant has amended claim 7, line 6, claims 13 and 16, line 3, and claims 14 and 13, line 2, to overcome these objections in accordance the Examiner's comments.

As for claims 13 and 16, line 2, Applicant respectfully traverses this objection but has also amended these claims to read "at least one frequency generator configured to generate one or more signals of varying frequencies" rather than "frequency generators." Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 8, lines 3-5, and elsewhere throughout the specification.

PATENT  
Docket No.: ST00015USU1 (108-US-U1)  
09/938,459

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections to claims 7, 13, 14, 16, and 17 have now been overcome, and therefore requests that the Examiner's objections be withdrawn at this time.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 6, at lines 1-2, claim 12, at line 7, and claims 16 and 17, at line 1, to overcome the indefiniteness referred to by the Examiner.

As for claim 7, at lines 2-3, the phrase "the second compressed signal" has been replaced with the phrase "a frequency reference signal" in the first clause of claim 7, and the phrase "the second compressed signal" has been replaced with the phrase "the frequency reference signal" in the second clause of claim 7. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 6, lines 18-19, page 7, lines 3-4, and elsewhere throughout the specification.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been overcome, and requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS/NEW CLAIMS

Additional amendments have been made to claims 2, 3, 4, and 12 to improve grammar and clarity and correct typos. Two new claims, 21 and 22, have been added. Support for claim

PATENT  
Docket No.: ST00015USU1 (108-US-U1)  
09/938,459

21 may be found, for example, at page 5, lines 14-16, and elsewhere throughout the specification and support for claim 22 may be found, for example, at page 8, line 20, through page 9, line 3, and elsewhere throughout the specification. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these Amendments. Additionally, Applicants reserve the right to present the amended claims in their original form in one or more continuation applications.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Barnard* in view of *Stehlik*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited references in combination fail to teach or suggest all the features or elements recited in each of the rejected claims.

With respect to independent claims 1, 5, and 12, the Examiner acknowledges that *Barnard* does not teach frequency shifting the filter lines of a first output signal or a first frequency shifter that includes a frequency generator. However, the Examiner cites the decimation filtering and decimation means 430 in FIG. 11 with the cascaded comb filter 454 shown in FIG. 14 of *Stehlik*. This, however, does not teach or disclose the frequency shifting or the frequency shifter that includes a frequency generator lacking in *Barnard*.

First, in general, *Stehlik* is related to analog signal receivers that derive digitized samples. Col. 2, lines 28-33. The signal processing referred to at the cited portions of *Stehlik* is related to the processing of a signal that has been digitized by an analog-to-digital converter and digital decimation filter mounted on a single IC chip. Col. 4, lines 62-65. In contrast, the claimed invention discloses analog filtering without digitization.

PATENT  
Docket No.: ST00015USU1 (108-US-U1)  
09/938,459

Second, *Stehlik* does teach or disclose frequency shifting the filter lines in an output signal of a comb filter using signals of varying frequencies generated by a frequency generator. Specification, page 8, lines 3-5. Nothing in *Stehlik* indicate the utilization of a frequency generator to process the digitized signals found in *Stehlik*.

Finally, the Examiner states that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the cascade comb filter with registers in the comb cells taught by *Stehlik* as *Barnard's* comb filter to generating a plurality of mixing signals at selected delays (frequencies) to compress the GPS signal in digital form to implement a lower cost, digital radio receiver for the purpose of taking advantages associated with digital circuitry (column 1, lines 28-40 '529)."

In fact, the opposite is true in that *Stehlik* teaches away from the claimed invention by reason of the portion of *Stehlik* cited by the Examiner: the monolithic receiver of *Stehlik* will have improved selectivity "compared to a conventional analog receiver, because the filtering employed in such a monolithic receiver is digitally implemented and thus capable of better performance than analog filters." Col. 1, lines 36-40.

Therefore, it is improper to combine *Barnard* and *Stehlik*, which in any case would not teach or suggest all the features or elements recited in each of claims 1, 5, and 12. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5, and 12 are patentable over 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Barnard* and *Stehlik*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1, 5, and 12 being in condition for allowance, dependent claims 2-4, 6-11, 21 and 22, and 13-20 that depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 1, 5, and 12, respectively, are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 07 2006


PATENT  
Docket No.: ST00015USU1 (108-US-UI)  
09/938,459CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Eclipse Group LLPDate: December 7, 2006

By:

Gregory B. Gulliver, Reg. No. 44,138  
Attorney for Applicant  
Phone: (847) 282-3551  
Fax: (818) 332-4205

Customer No. 34408